



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

conformed to it. A word of the Lord would have bound him, and then, further, as he claimed equal authority with the other apostles he could not have taken an isolated position in this matter. Hence we may infer from his treatment of baptism that the other apostles were not particular to perform the rite themselves.

Paul judged mildly of baptism for the dead (1 Cor. 15 : 29). It is probable that the dead for whom baptism was performed had accepted the gospel, but had not had opportunity for baptism. Two inferences may be drawn from this passage : (1) The rite of baptism in itself had relatively little significance for Paul. (2) The Corinthians laid great weight upon it. Here, then, in a special case we see the two moments which are decisive for the position of baptism in the theology of Paul. For him, baptism apart from faith was of secondary importance ; but the church held it in high esteem. The combination of these two facts explains the peculiar manner in which Paul has incorporated baptism into the circle of his religious and theological thought.

This article by Teichmann is in the main convincing. It shows that Paul regarded the rite of baptism as a convenient symbol, of no real meaning apart from faith, and not as being in itself a necessary ordinance. The article has strong incidental evidence against the genuineness of Matt. 28 : 19. The author does not touch the point of *household* baptism, nor does he refer to the *mode* of baptism. We may infer from his general position that he thought of Paul as indifferent in regard to the details of the rite.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

GEORGE H. GILBERT.

ZUR RECHTFERTIGUNG DER KINDERTAUF. VON P. LOBSTEIN ;  
*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1896, Heft 3, pp. 278-  
 298.

IN this article Professor Lobstein, of Strassburg, notices first the objections urged against infant baptism, (1) as foreign to evangelical faith, which is essentially personal ; (2) the lack of Scripture support ; and (3) that early church history shows no trace of infant baptism. Admitting the force of these objections, he finds that the alternative is either to postpone baptism till faith can become personal or to find new arguments for the baptism of infants. He decides for the latter, and sets himself to show how in our day, and in churches that have long been Christian, and are far from the relations of the mission churches of apostolic days, the baptism of infants can be defended on the broad ground of divine revelation and Christian nurture. It

does not rest upon some particular *dictum probans* of the Bible, but does spring from "the living spirit of the Christian revelation." Following this "organic" and not "atomistic" method of approaching the Scriptures, he finds infant baptism supported (1) as an "expression of the undeserved, anticipating love of God." His motto here is: "He first loved us." This is the heart of the gospel; not that we loved God but that he loved us. Jesus embodied this truth when he loved his own unto the end and gave his life for his enemies. He perfectly revealed, what the prophets also proclaimed, the free, gracious, unmerited, new-creating love of God. Deut. 7:7; 8:17; Jer. 31:3; Ezek. 16:6-8, etc., are quoted. The apostles magnify such love. Rom. 5:7 f.; John 15:16, etc., are referred to. And nowhere has "this message of grace, of peace and joy a more eloquent expression," a more "comprehensible and touching form," than in the baptism of babes and sucklings. The reformers felt this argument, and often presented infant baptism as a witness of the *gratia praeveniens* of the Heavenly Father. Every man is as helpless as an infant when the sovereign grace of God first touches him. All is of grace.

(2) Lobstein presents infant baptism next as an "expression of the glorious liberty (or independence, '*Unabhängigkeit*') of the love of God." His motto text here is: "He is greater than our heart." God's love to us does not depend upon our love to him. It is a great error to measure his affection for us by the standard of our devotion to him. Our hearts are fitful, but his love is ever the same. At times we know the unutterable joy of the love of God; but again there comes the "sad pain of separation and isolation." Our faith, however, clings to God, though we feel him not; and we hope in his salvation, though its joy be for a time absent. "The foundation of our eternal salvation does not rest upon the uncertain ground of our feelings or thoughts or efforts . . . but upon him who is without variableness or shadow of turning." "Our heart may condemn us, but God is greater than our heart." And nowhere does the truth of this text break forth with greater clearness than at the baptism of little children. Here love overflows all limits of age, ability, recognition. The child knows nothing of this love; neither does it know anything of the mother's love that guards its cradle. The recognition of the babe is no condition of either love. The reformers made this religious factor in infant baptism a motive power in some of the greatest doctrines of the gospel. They preached the gospel as the "word of life," the "promise of grace," as the unchangeable ground of Chris-

tian piety. Predestination for them was the assurance that the all-efficient grace of God was above all human changes. Justification by faith was nothing else than a "glorifying of the undeserved mercy of God." We had no more claim to it than the veriest babe. Here is the real ground of the zeal with which all the reformers fought for infant baptism.

(3) The last argument regards the baptism of children as an "expression of the unchangeable faithfulness of the love of God." The text cited is: "He cannot deny himself." All our sins and failures do not set aside Jesus our Advocate, and make void the grace and love of God. Hence the reformers urged all burdened souls to remember that they had been baptized as Christians, and God would not deny himself; his foundation stands sure. That is, to remember our baptism is to remember the word which God gave us, the grace which he promised, the salvation which he completed through Jesus Christ and communicates to us through his Holy Spirit. Baptism thus stands not for a magic power to wash away past sins, but for the ever-present, ever-uninterrupted grace of God.

Such a view of baptism, Lobstein says, rejects the Roman theory of baptismal regeneration, as well as the Lutheran idea of a germ of life or hope given in this ordinance. Such conceptions are unpsychological, more or less magical, and lead away from the protestant doctrines of the gospel. He adds that these thoughts of his on baptism are not to be regarded as "exhausting the theme." They deal with only "one of the ways" of treating the subject. They consider solely what has been called "the divine action" in this sacrament, which makes of it "an objective grace and a divine gift." The other side of baptism shows the reception of the child into the Christian society, its religious training, its gradual participation in all the blessings of the church of Christ. Here come the duties of parents, pastors, and others. On this phase of the subject he refers to the classical teachings of Zwingli as beyond all dispute true. He does not agree with Arnaud, that "in an epoch of deeper faith and greater enthusiasm we will give up infant baptism." He holds that faith and enthusiasm consist, not in rejecting such holy ordinances, but in fulfilling them, in restoring to the usages of the church their evangelical significance, and grasping them in their religious depth.

We heartily agree with this essay of Lobstein as far as it goes; though we think his alternative hardly does justice to either the biblical or the historical supports of infant baptism. The Scriptures teach that heredity may be good as well as bad, that

John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Ghost from his very birth, that God's promise is to both parents and their children, that regeneration is the way to salvation, hence if infants can be saved they can be regenerated, that the children of Christians are "holy" as others are not, and that circumcision carried with it all that evangelical churches claim for baptism. Calvin (*Institutes* IV, 16) and other reformers held that no argument urged against infant baptism does not apply against infant circumcision, which God commanded. We would hardly say with Calvin that the objections to pædobaptism from history are "shamefully contrary to truth," but we are convinced that much more can be urged from this source than Lobstein seems to think.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

H. M. SCOTT.

THE ARCHÆOLOGY OF THE MODE OF BAPTISM. By BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1896, pp. 601-644.

THE practice of the church is divided into an eastern and a western mode. Broadly speaking, the East baptizes by a trine immersion; the West by affusion. When we scrutinize the history of these differing practices, however, we quickly learn that, with whatever unessential variations in details, the usage of the East runs back into a high antiquity; while there are indications on the surface of the western usage that it is comparatively recent in origin, and survivals of an older custom persist side by side with it; so that there was a time when immersion was as universal in the West as in the East. There is a sense, then, in which we may say broadly that the present diversity in baptismal usage is a growth of time; and that, should we move back within the first millennium of the church's life, we should find the whole Christian world united in the ordinary use of trine immersion.

Was conformity to this mode of baptism held to be essential to the validity of baptism, or only necessary to the good order of the church? There never was a time when the church insisted upon immersion as the only valid mode of baptism. In support of this position may be cited the testimony of the *Didache* which allows affusion in case of scarcity of water; also, the well-known testimony of Cyprian concerning the validity of clinic baptism. It is also the assumption of the fathers in their discussion concerning the salvation of the apostles or of other ancient worthies who had died unbaptized. With whatever stringency trine immersion may have been held to be the only regular mode of baptism, other modes were not considered invalid. "We meet with no evidence from the writings of the fathers that baptism by affusion was held anything other than irregular and extraordinary; but we meet with no evidence that it was accounted void; it was even